



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

myself carefully compared, several times, the translation throughout Volume I with the text. Often I like the translation very much. It is full of life and vigor (at times, indeed, especially in the rendering of the expletives, the straining after vigor is far too manifest); it often hits off extremely well the spirit of a passage; there is a conscious effort to vary the tone of the translation, as the tone of the original varies (particularly in paratragedic passages does Professor Nixon seek to indicate the tone). The translation is not free, nor yet is it close; in many places, where I should be glad to know exactly Professor Nixon's views of the syntax of the Latin, I am unable to determine precisely his opinion. I have read only part of the second volume, but in that part I seemed to feel a toning down of the exuberance manifested now and then in the first volume. On the whole, then, the two volumes are to be heartily commended.

Several other volumes of The Loeb Classical Library I have studied with some care, e. g. the two volumes of the rendering of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, by Professor Miller, and the volume containing the translation of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* 1-6, by Professor Fairclough. In his renderings of the more lofty and serious passages of the *Aeneid* Professor Fairclough seems to me often very happy; I find him unsatisfactory at times in his translation of the *Eclogues*. Here his rendering often strikes me as too heavy; he misses the playful element which I find frequently in the *Eclogues*, as I believe Horace found it (see my paper, in *The American Journal of Philology* 38.195-199, on Horace's famous phrase, *molle atque facetum*, said by him of the *Eclogues*, in *Sermones* 1.10.44, and my notice of Dr. Dutton's pamphlet, *Reflections on Re-reading Vergil*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.57-58, 65-66). The book is praised by A. D. G. (= A. D. Godley?) in *The Classical Review* 30.203.

It is notoriously difficult to get a book through the press without typographical and other errors. During the past three or four years the difficulties in the way of handling the volumes of The Loeb Classical Library, for American authors, with two General Editors of the Library in England, with the compositors and the publisher in England, must have been very great. Yet some sorts of things remain unbelievable, until they in fact happen. For example, how can four competent scholars overlook the fact that a translation at a given point is based on a text different from that on the opposite page? In the Loeb Library edition of Ovid, the text of *Met.* 1.52-53 is printed as follows:

Imminet his aer, qui quanto est pondere terrae,
pondere aquae levior, tanto est onerosior igni.

There is no critical note of any sort on this page of the book. The Teubner text (Merkel, 1900) has no comma after 52, and gives, in 53, *pondus aquae levior*, with no hint of variant reading. Now Professor Miller's translation runs as follows:

The air hung over all, which is as much heavier than fire as the weight of water is lighter than the weight of earth.

In this translation Professor Miller defies at once his own text and his own punctuation.

The next three lines of the text, in Professor Miller's book, run as follows:

illic et nebulas, illic consistere nubes
iussit et humanas motura tonitrua mentes
et cum fulminibus facientes fulgora ventos.

The translation is as follows:

There did the creator bid the mists and clouds to take their place, and thunder, that should shake the hearts of men, and winds which with the thunderbolts make chilling cold.

How is "chilling cold" got from the text? The Teubner text gives *frigora* in 56, without hint of variant.

Again, in 1.225 occur the words *haec illi placet experientia veri*. These are not reproduced at all in the translation. In many other places there are no English equivalents for important words or phrases of the Latin original. In 1.192 the text appears thus:

sunt mihi semidei, sunt, rustica numina, nymphae

What the comma is doing after the second *sunt* the translation fails to indicate: "I have demigods, rustic divinities, nymphs", etc. After 1.81 there is a period, instead of the necessary comma (this may, to be sure, be a case of broken type). In 1.99 *sine militis usus* appears! In 1.267 read *rorant pennaque sinusque* (not *pennaeque*). In 1.355 read *duo* for *quo*; after 1.347 set a period, not a colon. All these errors have been found in a few verses. In connection with such things as these one is inclined to draw a very sharp indictment against the English General Editors, partly because, as is well known, they take a very active part in determining the final form of the various translations, partly because they are closer to the printers and the publishers of the Library.

C. K.

(To be concluded)

A STUDY OF DIETETICS AMONG THE ROMANS¹

The Romans were masters of many arts. Perhaps not least of these was the art of dining, an art which, though humble, seems destined to occupy a considerable portion of man's time and attention, for civilized man, however cultured, cannot live without cooks. Latin literature, especially that of the late Empire, abounds in references to Roman meals ranging from the simple fare of the rustic, consisting chiefly of vegetables, to the elaborate menu of the urbane Roman of Imperial days, or the wealthy gentleman rustivating at his country villa. Indeed, that delightful old gossip, Suetonius, even tells us what the Emperors ate, and how they ate it. A more interesting theme, however, than the exaggerated side of Roman luxury is the frequently neglected consideration of the daily fare of the average

¹This paper was read at the Twelfth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at the Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, May 4, 1918.

citizen. This consisted, in early days, at least, of grain, fruit, and vegetables, for the Romans of the good old days favored a vegetable diet and partook of meat sparingly and only on festive occasions. Mr. Warde Fowler says^{1a},

The needs of the poorer classes in respect to food and drink were small. Italians and Greeks then, as now, were almost entirely vegetarians. . . . Grain and vegetables were the staple food of the poor man in town and country.

Indeed, the early Romans were designated as *puliphaenonides* by Plautus², because the national diet consisted of a kind of porridge called pulse, which was composed³ of meal, salt, and water. Vegetables⁴ were chopped fine and added to this dish, which preceded even bread as an article of diet. Juvenal⁵ presents a picture of the good old days when the peasant's little farm supplied the whole family—the master, his wife, three sons, a home-born slave—with its daily fare. On the humble board huge bowls of smoking porridge awaited the elder brothers of the family, who from the plow homeward plod their weary way. Later, in the reign of Vitellius⁶, the one road to influence in the Roman world was to provide sumptuous banquets and glut the insatiate appetite of the Emperor, but the early Romans knew nothing of such preferment, lived the simple life, and dined on vegetables.

Our information in regard to this vegetable diet, and the esteem in which it was held, may be culled not only from medical writers, Celsus and others, from that ancient edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, Pliny's Natural History, and from writers on agriculture, but also from menus and references scattered elsewhere in the pages of Latin literature.

Virtue and simple living were always synonymous to the Romans. So highly did even the later members of that nation think of a vegetable diet that both Seneca⁷ and Martial⁸ represent Romulus as preferring a dinner of turnips even in the heavens. Pliny⁹ says that the Samnite envoys found Manius Curius Dentatus, the conqueror of Pyrrhus, cooking his meal of turnips on the hearth. The envoys felt that no gift which they could offer would tempt a man who was content with such plain fare for his daily food. Horace¹⁰ warmly expresses his approval of a vegetable diet. And again, this son of a freedman longs for the peace of the country, its simple fare, and its divine companionship¹¹:

'O when shall I sit down to my beans, and with them a dish of rich garden stuff which needs no sauce except the fat bacon?'

Cena deum is the name by which he dignifies this humble fare. This dinner of herbs would be accompanied by a feast of reason and a flow of soul¹². That even Horace did not always scorn a well served

meal, however, seems to be the implication of his slave Davus¹³, who says,

'If you do not happen to have an invitation to dine out, you praise your meal of herbs and call yourself a lucky man, but let Maecenas invite you to his table at eventide and off you go'.

Even in days later than those of Horace, philosophers preferred a simple diet culled from the garden. Aulus Gellius tells us¹⁴ that Taurus the philosopher entertained him at dinner when he was in Athens. The substance of this meal consisted of *aula una lentis Aegyptiae et cucurbitae inibi minutim caesae*. Tacitus¹⁵ informs us that, when Nero was ravaging the provinces to satisfy his prodigality, Seneca lived on very simple fare. Wild fruits which grew in the woods were his food, and he quenched his thirst at the waters of a clear stream.

The diet of the soldiers also consisted more largely of grain and vegetables than of meat. Tacitus¹⁶ and Caesar¹⁷ both mention as a hardship the fact that on certain occasions the soldiers had no food but meat with which to satisfy their hunger.

Another proof, if one were needed, of the esteem in which vegetable diet was held is the frequent mention, in Latin literature, of gardens. The garden and its products were highly honored in ancient Rome. There, as in our own country at the present day, every one was expected to do his bit by cultivating his garden. Cato¹⁸ says that, when a man was considered a good farmer, it was the highest compliment which could be paid him. Columella deemed the garden a theme worthy of poetry, and the Elder Pliny tells us¹⁹ that even the kings of Rome cultivated gardens with their own hands. The same author²⁰ says that the kitchen garden was under the supervision of the *mater familias* and that she was considered worthless if it was not carefully tended, for then the family would be reduced to the necessity of living on meat. Again, Pliny²¹ says that at Rome it was from the garden that the lower classes procured their daily food. Juvenal²² speaks approvingly of Epicurus, whose pure mind to one small garden every wish confined. Pliny²³ even calls our attention to the rather surprising fact that cognomina were derived from the garden.

'Let the garden have its full share of honor, for from it men of the highest rank have been content to borrow their names'.

The Valerian gens, Lactucini, took its name from lettuce. The Lentuli²⁴, Fabii, and Caepiones were indebted to the garden for theirs also.

In addition to the evidence of the esteem in which gardens were held by the Romans, and to expressions favoring a vegetable diet, examples of vegetable menus are also found. A few may be cited. The earliest, perhaps, is that of a slaves' convivium which is found in Plautus²⁵. It consists of nuts, olives, figs, beans, and lupine.

^{1a}Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero, 32.
²Poenulus 54. ³Blumner, Die Römischen Privataltertümer, 162.
⁴Pliny, N. H. 18.83. ⁵14.166 ff.
⁶Tacitus, Hist. 2.95. ⁷Apocolocyntosis 9.5. ⁸12.16.
⁹Compare Cicero, C. M. 55; Plutarch, Cato 2; Aulus Gellius 1.14 (for the story of Fabricius).
¹⁰Epp. 1.12.7 ff. ¹¹Serm. 2.6.63 ff. ¹²Serm. 2.6.70 ff.

¹³Serm. 2.7.29-34. ¹⁴8.8. ¹⁵Ann. 15.45. ¹⁶Ann. 14.24.
¹⁷B. G. 7.17.3. ¹⁸De Agricultura, Introd. 2-3. ¹⁹19.49.
²⁰19.57. ²¹19.51. ²²13.122; 14.319.
²³19.59. ²⁴Pliny, N. H. 18.10. ²⁵Stichus 690 ff.

In a fanciful story, Ovid²⁶ gives a charming picture of peasant life. The scene is laid in Phrygia, but represents none the less the manner of life of Italian peasants of Ovid's own day. In his characteristically charming style he tells of a dinner which was served by the two aged peasants, Philemon and Baucis, to the gods Mercury and Jupiter, when in disguise these deities appeared at their humble cottage. The meal was the best the kindly peasants could offer, yet frugal, consisting chiefly of vegetables—ripe and green olives, pickled cornel berries, endive, eggs cooked in the warm ashes, wine, bacon and cabbage, nuts, dried figs, dates, plums, mellow apples, and purple grapes. Even the bacon was a special delicacy, something in which the peasants themselves did not ordinarily indulge.

The menu of Ofellus²⁷, an old neighbor of Horace, also belongs to this class. Horace makes the old farmer say,

'I was never one to eat anything on a working day except a mess of garden stuff with a fitch of smoked bacon. If, after a long interval, a friend had come to see me, or a neighbor of whom I was fond had dropped in on a rainy day, we enjoyed ourselves, not, however, with fish sent from the market, but with a chicken or a kid. The dessert consisted of raisins from the string, nuts and figs'.

Although this menu was not entirely vegetable, it consisted at least of the products of the old man's farm, and the chicken and the kid were served only as compliments to his guests.

Among Vergil's lesser poems the *Moretum* presents a somewhat similar picture of peasant life. The small farmer, Simylus, rises at dawn, lights the fire on his hearth, and grinds the meal for his daily bread. He has no side of bacon hanging from the rafters; he has only a cheese; but he has also a flourishing garden spot. Cabbage, beets, rich sorrel, mallows, leeks, lettuce all grow there, also onions and endive. This morning the master gathers leaves of parsley, rue, and coriander, and takes them into the house to be made into the concoction which gave the poem its name. As Mr. Warde Fowler²⁸ has pointed out, although the *Moretum* may be a translation of a Greek poem, it serves to show what was the ordinary food of the Italian peasant of Vergil's own day. Vergil²⁹ has left us also the menu of a shepherd's evening meal—mealy chestnuts, mellow apples, and abundance of cheese.

Another menu of a later date which consists chiefly of vegetables is found in a dinner invitation which Martial³⁰ sends to a friend. The menu, says Martial, will consist of cheap Cappadocian lettuce, onions, salt tunny fish, garnished with eggs, hot cabbage fresh from the garden, sausages resting on snowy pulse, beans, and bacon with a streak of fat and a streak of lean. The dessert, says the prospective host, will be raisins, Syrian pears, roasted Neapolitan chestnuts, and wine. If Bacchus shall have roused a second appetite, there

will be added olives, hot chick-pea, and warm lupine. That to the average man a vegetable menu had lost some of its attractions in Martial's day is shown by the fact that in the beginning Martial only bids his friend Toranius fast with him and at the end of the menu he says, *Parva est cenula. Quis potest negare?* Instances of the vegetable menu might be multiplied.

Even in the later days of the Empire, when many of the Romans had departed far from the simple diet of the early peasants, they still approved of it in theory at least, and respected such of their number as had the self-control to partake thereof. Such a diet was always associated in their minds with the stern virtues of the good old Roman days—self-control, honesty, self-respect. Says Martial³¹,

'If the pale bean boils for you in the earthen pot, you may decline the invitations of rich patrons'.

In other words, you may keep your self-respect.

It would seem, then, from the many expressions in favor of a vegetable diet, from the esteem in which gardens were held, as well as from the vegetable menus themselves, that the early Romans and those who lived in the country were almost wholly vegetarians. Even at a later date, the nation, at least those of its members who favored the retention of the virtues of early times, dined on vegetables to a much greater extent than has been accredited to it by writers who have been attracted by the dinner of a Nasidienus or a Trimalchio. Exceptions such as these, the drinking of liquid pearls and dining on dishes composed of singing birds, nightingales's tongues and peacocks's brains, although the least representative, have become the best known, specimens of Roman meals. However, as Friedländer³² has pointed out, luxury at table even under the Empire has been stigmatised as frightful and unnatural chiefly because the exceptions have been taken to prove the rule.

An interesting problem which is suggested as one studies the more elaborate menus of a later date is a question of dietetics. Did the Romans in arranging the courses of their meals consider their appetites alone, or were they influenced to some extent at least by a knowledge of food values, and of the wholesomeness or unwholesomeness of certain articles? Were the content of their courses and the order in which they were served the result of this knowledge? The conceit of the modern world, particularly of the modern scientific world, in its achievements, leads it to suppose that its theories and its problems are entirely new. However, the more one studies the literature of the Romans and the Greeks, the more one is inclined to agree with Solomon that there is nothing new under the sun. There is scarcely a problem in the complicated food situation of our own day which was not familiar to the Romans. Attempts at food control were made by the successive sumptuary laws which were passed even during Republican days, and which were renewed and

²⁶Met. 8.618-685.

²⁷Hor. *ice*, *Serm.* 2.2. 116 ff.

²⁸Social Life at Rome in the Age of *Cicero*, 33.

²⁹Eclogue 1.80 f.

³⁰5.78.

³¹13.7.

³²Sittengeschichte. 3.29 ff.

made more stringent under the Empire. These laws, though seldom successful, endeavored to regulate not only the cost of a banquet even on festal days, but the kind of food which was served. The earliest, the *Lex Orchia*³³, 181 B. C., prescribed the number of guests one might entertain. The *Lex Licinia*³⁴, 107 B. C., limited the amount of meat to be consumed daily.

The *Lex Cornelia*³⁵ set a tax on dainties which gourmards particularly desired. The *Lex Aemilia*³⁶, a later law, endeavored to control not only the price but also the kind of food, and the manner of its preparation.

The enforcement of food laws was a problem in the Roman world as in our own. Julius Caesar³⁷ stationed guards in various parts of the market to seize and bring to him dainties which were exposed for sale in violation of these laws. Sometimes he even despatched his soldiers and his lictors with orders to take away from any dining-room any articles of food which had escaped the vigilance of the guards in the market-place. It was unlawful for a *cena* to be served behind closed doors. Tiberius³⁸ proposed that the prices in the market should be regulated each year at the discretion of the Senate, while aediles were instructed to put such restrictions on cook-shops and eating-houses as not to allow even pastry to be exposed for sale.

Apuleius, in his *Metamorphoses*³⁹, even introduces us to a food administrator of ancient times. With Dr. Harvey W. Wiley's permission I am giving his free translation of this passage concerning an encounter with Mr. Hoover's remote predecessor:

"Holy Moses", said I, "Who is this I see? It surely beats the band to see you in this gorgeous uniform all spangled with decorations. And such a crowd of attendants! You must be the mayor of the town, old friend Pythias". He replied, "Not so bad as that. I am only the Food Administrator of this municipality. Is there anything in particular you would like to have for your supper?" "Thanks awfully", I replied, "I have already bought fish for my dinner". When Pythias saw my basket (for they had no delivery system in this market), he took it and made a careful inspection of its contents. "How much did you pay for these minnows?", he said. "The horrid fish profiteer", I replied, "wanted a whole silver plunk for this bunch of flappers, but finally he let me have them for two dimes". Taking me by the hand, Pythias led me into the Central Market and said, "Show me the scoundrel who cheated you so egregiously". "That is he crouching in the corner", said I, pointing my finger at the mercenary wretch, who seemed to shrink up as soon as he saw the Food Administrator looking at him. Pythias rushed up to the Shylock of the Billingsgate and gave him a tongue lashing. "You food shark", he said, "how dare you play such a shabby trick on this old chunk of my College days? You must be trying to make a desert of this fair country by your exorbitant prices. You shall never have another fish to sell if you take more than a nickel a pound. You'll know what a Food Administrator is before I get through with you". With that, Pythias seized my basket of fish and

poured them on the floor of the market, and jumped on the measly minnows with all four feet. Then Pythias patted himself on the back and said, "See how great a man I am, and how I conserve food, and punish the violators of my regulations". So I, blinded by the mighty power and diligence of the Food Administrator, went my way minus both my money and my supper.

Efforts were made to restrict luxury by personal example as well as by law. Tiberius⁴⁰ served at a formal dinner meat left over from the day before, or half a boar. A modern parallel is the less elaborate entertainment in the White House and in society in general during the past year.

Quite late in the Empire the attempt was still being made to control the price of food by law. Two interesting instances of these efforts are given by Professor F. F. Abbott. The Edict of Diocletian⁴¹, in an attempt to bring prices down to normal, fixed the maximum prices at which grain, beef, eggs, wheat, pork, fish, vegetables, clothing, and other articles could be sold, and prescribed the death penalty for a higher figure. The law was repealed from necessity. Sixty years later the Emperor Julian⁴² made a similar attempt on a small scale. By an edict he fixed the price of grain for the people of Antioch. Holders of grain hoarded their stock. The Emperor brought supplies of it from Egypt and sold it at the legal price. It was bought up by speculators, and in the end, says Professor Abbott, Julian, like Diocletian, had to acknowledge his inability to cope with an economic law.

(To be concluded)

THE HARCUM SCHOOL,
Bryn Mawr.

CORNELIA G. HARCUM.

AGRIPPINA AS AN ARMY NURSE

Medical attendance in the Roman armies is a subject on which we cannot gain much information from the Roman writers. Occasional references are made in Tacitus to such matters as the lack of medicines (*Ann.* 1.65), the preparation of poultices and bandages (*Ann.* 15.54, 55), and the visiting of the wounded by sympathetic generals. But one incident, mentioned in *Ann.* 1.69, has a peculiar interest on account of the ancient Florence Nightingale performance therein described. It appears that, in the struggle which Germanicus was waging with Arminius, an unfounded rumor had spread that the Germans were about to cross the Rhine in an attack on Gaul. But for the timely action of Agrippina, wife of the general, some panic-stricken soldiers would have destroyed the bridge and so have brought disaster to many of their comrades. She also furnished clothing, medicine, and encouragement to the soldiers at this time. The words of Tacitus are: *Sed femina ingens animi munia ducis per eos dies induit, militibusque, ut quis inops aut saucius, vestem et fomenta dilargita est.* *Tradit C. Plinius, Germanicorum bellorum scriptor, stetisse*

³³Macrobious, *Sat.* 3.17.2.

³⁴Macrobious, *Sat.* 3.17.8; Aulus Gellius 2.24.7.

³⁵Macrobious, *Sat.* 3.17.11.

³⁶Suetonius, *Caes.* 43.

³⁷*I. 24-25.*

³⁸Aulus Gellius 2.24.12.

³⁹Suetonius, *Tib.* 34.

⁴⁰Suetonius, *Tib.* 34.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 177-178.

⁴²The Common People of Ancient Rome, 151 ff.